



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 10/777893 | 2/12/04 | RUSH | CST-201 CIP |
| 10/175486 | 6/19/02 | RUSH | CST-201 |

| EXAMINER |
|-----------|
| PENSEE DO |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 1641 | |

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) WONG LE (PTO) (3) JAMES CULLEN 9/15/06
(2) PENSEE DO & BONNIE EYLER (PTO) DR. JOHN RUSH
ANDREW WARNER

Date of interview 8/15/06

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: References by Peters et al. +
Reinders et al.

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached.

Claims discussed: All of Records

Identification of prior art discussed: Kanner & Wirth

Applicants argue the enablement rejection was improper because prima facie was not established.
Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants distinguish the
present invention from Kanner by submitting that Kanner fails to teach isolation
of peptides. It is argued that Kanner's proteinaceous preparation would contain
minor amount of peptide. Applicants will amend step (a) of claim 1 to distinguish
from Kanner. Applicants also argue that Kanner does not teach step (c) of claim 1.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) Further, Applicants argue that Kanner & Wirth would not be enabled to make the present invention based on all elements previously submitted.

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner's Signature